REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, and 5-20 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate dependent claims 2, 4 and canceled subject matter from claim 8. Claim 5 is amended to indicate dependency to claim 1. Claim 19 has been amended to overcome the non-statutory subject matter rejection. Claims 2 and 4 are canceled. No new matter has been added.

I.   Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Liu in the August 11, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II.   Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 19 is rejected for having a term "computer usable media" that encompasses radio wave communication as illustrated in the specification on paragraphs [0065]-[0067]. The Office Action asserts that this is per se nonstatutory. Claim 19 has been amended to disclose a computer usable hardware medium, which indicates hardware described in paragraph [0064] and a portion of [0067] of the specification. Claim 19, as amended, is directed to statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III.   Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Serbinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466). Also, claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Serbinis in view of Jin (US Pat. No. 6,330,689). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Serbinis discloses a plurality of workflow modules that can be added or removed. Specifically, during the interview, Examiner Liu indicated Serbinis at col. 8, lines 48-53 discloses "at one or more authorized users (e.g., personal computer),"

and that this indicates that there are a plurality of workflow modules that can be added or removed. Applicants respectfully disagree. Having one or more authorized users does not indicate that a workflow module can be removed or added. To further explain this distinction, the specification at [0022] indicates that users are different from workflow modules and workflow systems. Serbinis only indicates that there can be one or more authorized users, which is not equivalent to the number of workflow modules.

Examiner Liu also indicated that Serbinis at col. 8, lines 48-55 discloses that one or more documents are managed by a workflow module according to the subject matter described in one or more documents. Specifically, Examiner Liu indicated that a filtering function indicates that more subject matter is managed by a workflow module. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The claim language states that "subject matter described in one or more documents" is used to determine the flow of documents. Serbinis does not teach managing documents by a workflow module according to the subject in the document itself. Thus, there is a distinction between the filtering of documents and allocating documents based upon translation and according to the subject matter described in a document as claimed.

Additionally, Examiner Liu indicated that Serbinis, at col. 8 lines 63-67, indicates that a first workflow module publishes to a document repository a first document which is detected by the DNDS and pertains to a subject of interest of a second workflow module. Applicants respectfully disagree. Based on analysis of Serbinis, col. 8, lines 63-67 and col. 9, lines 50-67, Serbinis indicates that users have documents that are available. This does not indicate that there are two or more workflow modules that interact with each other. This only indicates that documents are available for a user. There is no indication in Serbinis of multiple workflow modules working together as described in claims 1, 10, and 19.

Moreover, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate features from dependent claims 2, 4 and 8. In particular, claim 1 recites a subject refinement module and uses subject refinement data to refine subjects in a subject directory. Serbinis fails to teach these features.

Jin does not cure the deficiencies of Serbinis. Thus, for other reasons given above, claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable over the recited references. Further, the dependent claims 3, 5-9, 11-18 and 20 are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above in connections with claims 1, 10 and 19 as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103 rejections.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Abdul Q. Basit
Registration No. 61,788

JAO:AQB/lmf

Date: August 19, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461